

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 6-31, 36-37 remain in this application. Claims 1, 16 and 29 have been amended. Claims 36-37 have been added. Claims 4, 5, and 32-35 have been canceled, without prejudice.

Claims 16-18 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicants believe the amendments to claims 16 and 29 overcome the rejection. Applicants use of phrasing with regard to corresponding layers clarifies the meaning of the term "like perform", in that the claim refers to the viscosity match between the inner and outer layers of a chlorine-doped perform compared to a second perform which, except for an absence of chlorine doping, is otherwise identical to the first perform. In other words, the perform compared to itself had it not been chlorine doped. This concept is made amply clear on page 8, lines 16-22 of Applicants' disclosure. Applicants further believe the meaning of the phrase "viscosity matching" is well represented on page 4, lines 1-9 of the disclosure, and one skilled in the art would understand the phrase to mean the closeness of the respective viscosities of the subject layers, as further stated on page 8, lines 19-22. Applicants believe the amendment adequately addresses the Examiner's §112 rejection and the rejection on page 4 of the present Office Action.

Claims 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Kyoto 5,145,507.

Claims 32-35 have been canceled.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa, and further in view of Kingery's "Introduction to Ceramics", pages 219-226.

The Examiner argues Fick's law of diffusion directs that the higher the concentration of solute (chlorine in the present case), the more of the solute which diffuses into a body. The Examiner further states that in accordance with the ideal gas law, the higher the pressure, the higher the concentration of solute. Finally, the Examiner

concludes that it would have been obvious to use as high a pressure as reasonably possible so as to maximize the amount of chlorine in the perform. However, neither Ishikawa nor Kingery teach an absolute pressure of the chlorine-containing atmosphere being substantially greater than 1.013×10^2 kPa while limiting the mole percentage of chlorine present in the atmosphere to between about 20% and 40%. According to the Examiner's argument, one skilled in the art would seek to employ as high a pressure as possible to maximize the concentration of solute and thereby maximize the amount of chlorine in the preform. It would therefore have not been simultaneously obvious to limit the concentration of solute as Applicants claim.


Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, Applicants believe the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants believe that no extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should applicants be in error, applicants respectfully request that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Kevin M. Able at 607-974-2637.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Able
Agent for Assignee
Reg. No. 52,401
Corning Incorporated
SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831
607-974-2637

DATE: January 5, 2005